

MEETING NOTICE
AAA4 ADVISORY COUNCIL

(916) 486-1876

DATE: October 17, 2024
TIME: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Our Mission: Enriching the lives of older adults and people with disabilities by **FOSTERING** networks of support, **ADVOCATING** for individual choice, **COLLABORATING** with others, **ENSURING** equity, and **STRIVING** to do so with conviction.

PLACE: **SACRAMENTO COUNTY**
Agency on Aging Area 4
1401 El Camino Avenue
Suite 400 ~ Board Room
Sacramento, CA 95815

AGENDA

- I. **CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL, WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS**
- II. **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**
- III. **CONSENT CALENDAR**
 - A. Adopt the Agenda..... 2 min.
 - B. Approve Minutes From 9/19/24..... 2 min.
- IV. **CORRESPONDENCE** 0 min.
Not applicable
- V. **ACTION ITEM** 10 min.
 - A. Adopt the Slate of Officers for 2025
- VI. **DISCUSSION/PRESENTATIONS**80 min.
 - A. Services for Seniors with the Braille and Talking Book Library, *presented by California State Library Librarian, Laura Kellen*
 - B. Challenges Serving Small, Rural Counties, *pre-recorded video, Sutter County Supervisor Ziegenmeyer and Sutter County Health & Human Services Director Sarah Eberhardt-Rios*
 - C. Final Preparations for Parity Decision Points around County Funding Levels (continued), *presented by Will Tift*
 - D. Master Plan on Aging: Highlights from the October 8 Action Day, *presented by Will Tift*
- VII. **REPORTS**..... 20 min.
 - A. Executive Committee
 - B. Governing Board
 - C. Advisory Council, Nominating and Diversity Committee
 - D. Grants Review Committee
 - E. Strategic Planning Committee
 - F. Executive Director

COMMITTEE MEETING
Executive Committee: Thursday, 10/17/24, 9:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

PAGE TWO

VIII. ROUNDTABLE: ANNOUNCEMENTS 6 min.

IX. ADJOURNMENT 0 min.

Attachments to be sent under separate cover

- Not applicable

***Members of the public wishing to join the meeting via Zoom, please use the link below:**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87983667440>

If you need a disability-related reasonable accommodation to participate in this meeting, please contact the AAA4 office at (916) 486-1876, or email AdvisoryCouncil@AgencyOnAging4.org at least 3 days in advance with your accommodation request. Every effort will be made to accommodate. However, we cannot guarantee we will be able to honor requests received less than 3 days in advance.

**AGENCY ON AGING AREA 4
ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

Date: September 19, 2024

Location: Nevada County

I. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL, WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Kelly Carpenter called the meeting to order at 9:59 a.m., welcoming members and guests. A quorum was established.

County	AC Members Present – 13	Excused = 2; Absent = 5
Nevada	K. Carpenter; A. Mikal-Heine	
Placer	K. Flanagan	D. Wiltsee (A)
Sacramento	Dr. C. Koss; M. Jacobs; S. McBride; A. Zonderman	Dr. T. Abah (A)
Sierra	No members	
Sutter	T. Thomas	P. Epley (E)
Yolo	J. Bohon; C. Dorsey	S. Brunner (A)
Yuba	D. Panteloglow; L. Drown; R. Drown	
At-Large		P. Nelson (A); R. Saenz (A); H. Linder (E)

**Teleconferencing according to AB 2449 Brown Act Emergency Provision.*

AAA4 Staff Present: Will Tift, Jodi Mesa, Kiel Adams and Rashana Wright.

Guests Present: Mindy Klick, Executive Director at *Meals on Wheels Sacramento County*.

Staff via Zoom: Julie Beckner, Nancy Vasquez, Sara Martinez, Maggie Borowiak, Julie Bates, Marion Walker, Rebecca Hensley, Anson Houghton and Agboo Abeywickrama.

Zoom Guests: David Wiltsee (*AAA4 Advisory Council Member ~ Placer County*), Jennifer Massello (*Director of Programs at Meals on Wheels Sacramento County*), Janice Labrado (*Director of Accessible Services at Sacramento Regional Transit*), Harrison Linder (*AAA4 Advisory Council At-Large-Member ~ Sacramento County*), Bonnie Patterson (*Executive Director at Rebuilding Together*), Julie Rhoten (*Executive Director at Stanford Settlement*) and Meghan Rose (*AAA4 Governing Board Chair*)

II. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC – The Diversity, Equite, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) Committee will begin meetings in October. If you are interested in joining Charlotte and Melissa in the work, please reach out and let me know Julie Bates (*Program Manager/Developer at AAA4*) at jbates@agencyonaging4.org.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Motion to adopt the agenda and approve minutes from 8/15/24.

Motion	Second	Passed
T. Thomas	K. Flanagan	Y=13; N= 0; Abstain=0

IV. CORRESPONDENCE – *Not Applicable*

V. ACTION ITEM

A. Select Council Members to Serve on the Nominating Committee.

Motion	Second	Passed
J. Bohon	M. Jacobs	Y=13; N= 0; Abstain=0

- The Members that were appointed to the Nominating Committee are as follows:
 - Dr. Catheryn Koss
 - Karen Flanagan
 - Rob Drown
 - Harrison Linder

VI. DISCUSSION/PRESENTATIONS**

A. HICAP 101: The Health Insurance Counseling & Advocacy Program and You, *pre-recorded video, presented byCarolynn Washington*

- This was originally showcased at the 9.13.24 Governing Board Meeting

B. The Unique Challenges of Serving Frontier Communities, *pre-recorded video, presented by Sierra County Supervisors Dryden and Heuer*

- This was originally showcased at the 9.13.24 Governing Board Meeting

C. Final Preparations for Parity Decision Points around County Funding Levels, *presented by Will Tift*

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Committee – *Kelly Carpenter*

- The Executive Committee met on September 19, 2024, and reviewed the agenda.
- Kelly Carpenter wanted to thank Dr. Koss for stepping in and Chairing last meeting 8.15.2024.
- Discussion on Advisory Council Terms of Appointment
 - Currently on the State Fiscal Year (July – June)
 - Wanting to change to a Calendar Year (January – December); to coincide with the Governing Board
 - Looking into changing the Bylaws to make this change, this may take place in 2025

B. Governing Board – *Rashana Wright*

- The Governing Board met on September 13, 2024, in Sacramento County where a quorum was established.
- The Board had only one action item:
 - They approved the JPEC recommendations for SFY 2023-24
- The Board also heard presentations on:
 - HICAP 101: The Health Insurance Counseling & Advocacy Program and You, *presented byCarolynn Washington*
 - CA 2030: Next Steps, *excerpts from the 9/4/24 CDA Webinar*
 - The Unique Challenges of Serving Frontier Communities, *presented by Sierra County Supervisors Dryden and Heuer*
 - Final Preparations for Parity Decision Points around County Funding Levels: A Straw Poll Exercise, *conducted by Will Tift*

C. HICAP Coordinating Committee – *Rebecca Hensley*

- We fund HICAP and MIPPA programs in 9 counties, our 7-county service area plus El Dorado and San Joaquin counties.
 - We hold HICAP Coordinating Committee meetings 3 times per year.
 - On August 16 we met in Lodi and representatives from AAA4, Legal Services of Northern CA and El Dorado and San Joaquin counties were present.
 - Information was shared about Medicare updates – Inflation Reduction Act 2025, \$2,000 out of pocket part D cap.
- HICAP is facing ongoing staffing challenges and needs more staff in Yuba/Sutter and Sacramento counties.
 - Currently working on updating their volunteer orientation process to hopefully keep potential volunteers engaged while they wait for training.
- MIPPA (Medicare Improvements for Patients and Providers Act) is an outreach program to help Medicare beneficiaries with limited income know about all the programs that could save them money on prescription drugs.
 - A Spring advertising campaign is coming soon for all 9 counties to refer low-income beneficiaries to HICAP.

D. Joint Program Evaluation Committee (JPEC) – *Will Tift*

- JPEC met on September 13, 2024, right after the Governing Board meeting.
 - Approved all the scope of service changes for 2024-25 as requested by the funded programs.
 - Changes will move forward for approval at the Governing Board meeting next month in October 2024.

E. Legislative Committee – *Jim Bohon and Dr. Julie Bates*

- The Legislative Committee may hold a special session, however if not they will continue meetings when Legislature is back in session.

F. Executive Director - *Will Tift (filling in for Pam Miller)*

- Introduction of new staff support person for Governing Board and Advisory Council, Rashana Wright.
- The Fiscal Department is fully staffed, we will be processing claims as quickly as possible.
- Several Projects in the works:
 - Data exchange framework (DXF) – how to work towards successfully sharing client’s personal health information (PHI), kick-off meeting held September 5, 2024.
 - Received final approval of budget changes of Nutrition infrastructure.
 - Mercy Medical Group in Elk Grove – Medicare reimbursement program, 16-month demonstration pilot program, planning is now underway.
- Grants Review Committee has been confirmed for October 4th, 2024
 - Advisory Council Members to join the Grants Review Committee are Laura and Rob Drown.
- The Area Plan Committee meeting will be postponed until November 2024.
- C4A, 3-day Annual Strategic Planning Retreat. Will attended the first 2 days and Jim Bohon attended day 3.
 - Day 1 & 2 were about the imminent passing of SB1249. They split this information around three topic areas:
 1. Boundaries and Governance
 2. Core Services
 3. Changes to the Intrastate Funding Formula (IFF)
 - Day 3 – *Jim Bohon’s* take aways:
 1. CDA is working hard to establish that they are open for input; on fast track to develop program regulations and IFF changes
 2. How they can measure Core Services
 3. There may be a change for local AAA’s if a new proposed Planning & Service Area (PSA) is adopted
 4. There will be a survey sent to all AAA, for a one voice one entry for each agency

VIII. ROUNDTABLE: ANNOUNCEMENTS – *Not applicable*

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kelly Carpenter called for a motion for adjournment at 11:59 a.m.

****TO LISTEN TO THE FULL AUDIO OR REQUEST MATERIALS FROM THIS MEETING, PLEASE EMAIL AdvisoryCouncil@AgencyOnAging4.org**

Recordings are on file for one year.

ACTION ITEM V. A.

TO: AAA4 ADVISORY COUNCIL
FROM: Nominating Committee
DATE: October 10, 2024
SUBJECT: Adopt the Slate of Officers for 2025

The Nominating Committee met on October 7th, 2024, and unanimously agreed upon the following slate of officers for calendar year 2025:

Chair: Dr. Catheryn Koss (Sacramento County)

Vice Chair: Karen Flanagan (Placer County)

Secretary: Sylvia McBride (Sacramento County)

- ✓ Additional nominations may be made from the floor prior to votes being cast.
- ✓ Elections are scheduled for the December Advisory Council meeting.
- ✓ This item requires a roll call vote.

PRESENTATION ITEM VI. A.

TO: AAA4 ADVISORY COUNCIL
FROM: Pam Miller
DATE: October 10, 2024
SUBJECT: Services for Seniors with the Braille and Talking Book Library

Librarian Laura Kellen will go over what the Braille and Talking Book Library offers to all individuals with a disability, especially what it offers to our aging adults 65+.

PRESENTATION ITEM VI. B.

TO: AAA4 ADVISORY COUNCIL
FROM: Pam Miller
DATE: October 10, 2024
SUBJECT: Challenges Serving Small, Rural Counties

At the request of Sutter County Supervisor Ziegenmeyer, this presentation will provide additional insights into living, working and growing old in small, rural counties.

The Council will view a recording of the October 11th presentation to the Governing Board.

DISCUSSION ITEM VI. C.

TO: AAA4 ADVISORY COUNCIL

FROM: Pam Miller

DATE: October 10, 2024

SUBJECT: Final Preparations for Parity Decision Points around County Funding Levels: A Straw Poll Exercise (continued)

NOTE: What follows is a copy of the Discussion Item for the Board October 11th meeting; an update will be provided during the October 17th Council meeting.

BACKGROUND (For ease of reference, this section repeats the information that appeared in the September 2024 Board Packet, **except for revisions in green.**)

Since 1994, AAA4 has applied California’s Intrastate Funding Formula (IFF) to determine how most¹ Older Americans Act (OAA) program funds should be distributed to the seven counties in an equitable manner. At AAA4, this practice is commonly referred to as “parity.” The total dollars that are subject to allocation through parity is known as the “parity pool.”

At the direction of the national Administration on Aging, each State began developing its own version of the IFF (a.k.a., a “parity formula”) in the early 1980s. This sparked a series of lawsuits in California and around the country from various parties who felt these formulas were unfair. In 1989, a federal district court ruling in the Florida case of Meek v. Martinez provided helpful clarification and guidance. Shortly thereafter, the California Department of Aging (CDA) finalized its IFF and began using it to allocate OAA funds to the State’s agencies on aging. The IFF still includes the following four demographic factors and weights² – the same set AAA4 has used for the last 30 years:

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Weight</u>
Persons age 60+ non-minority	1.0
Persons age 60+ minority	2.0
Persons age 60+ low-income	2.0
Persons age 60+ geographically isolated	1.5

Parity has been controversial at AAA4 because resetting it often leads to significant net financial gains and losses for certain counties and thus for the funded partners operating within them. While there have been numerous discussions about altering AAA4’s application of the Parity Formula in recent years (especially about adding new factors to the formula), no such changes have been approved by the Governing Board.

¹ AAA4 does not apply the IFF in circumstances where program funds are being used to serve the entire seven-county service area under a single program or service such as the Health Insurance Counseling and Advocacy Program (HICAP) and Long-Term Care Ombudsman & Elder Abuse Prevention services.

² With respect to Title III-D Disease Prevention and Health Promotion funds only, CDA now also uses “Medi-Cal Eligible 60+” with a weight of 1.0. It is unclear when this fifth factor was added.

Parity resets have caused significant funding fluctuations for two separate reasons. First, the data used to compute parity is updated annually, but the formula is only recalculated once every four years. While this keeps awards stable *during* the subsequent 4-year funding (RFP) cycle, it also compounds the impacts that must occur *after* they are over. Second, Funded Partners' individual awards sometimes change in ways that push net county allocations above or below their parity shares. This is called "parity drift."

If a county is gradually losing parity share and collecting more than its existing share of funds (drifting high) at the same time, then a parity reset could result in tens of thousands of dollars being shifted out of that county. This is precisely what happened in 2008 when the parity reset caused a sudden \$120,000 shortfall in Nevada County. Since then, AAA4 has taken measures to curb such extreme losses; going forward, the Agency may conclude additional measures are warranted.

For planning purposes, the graphic on the following page shows **initial** "non-adjusted" parity percentages for 2024. It uses the most **current** data sources that are used by (and provided by) CDA to calculate the IFF, and those calculations result in a specific "parity percentage" for each county.

CDA's newest IFF data reflects a 10-year correction in geographic isolation because historically, those numbers have been based on the decennial Census. AAA4 Staff had expected to see significant reductions in those figures as communities that were once rural are now classified as urban. **Instead, we have seen substantial increases!** This surprising result is caused by CDA adopting a broader definition of "rural area" than it was using previously.

PSA 4 continues to have many more rural residents than any other service area in the State, and the Agency (as a whole) continues to benefit from the IFF as a result.

Prior to any Board-approved adjustments, only Nevada and Placer Counties are projected to see a net increase in their parity share because their rate of growth exceeds that of the other five Counties.

INITIAL Parity Calculations for 2024

(Not Adjusted for Sierra County)

Source Data:

County	60+ Total Population ^a	60+ Non-Minority ^a	60+ Minority ^a	60+ Low Income ^b	60+ Geographic Isolation ^c
Nevada	41,113	37,707	3,406	4,380	18,724
Placer	115,115	92,032	23,083	9,505	20,110
Sacramento	345,815	195,137	150,678	45,635	11,100
Sierra	1,530	1,399	131	160	1,286
Sutter	23,037	13,186	9,851	3,245	3,940
Yolo	44,852	28,187	16,665	5,185	4,547
Yuba	15,839	10,742	5,097	2,360	6,476
Totals	587,301	378,390	208,911	70,470	66,183

Application of the Formula:

Weight	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.5				
County	60+ Non-Minority	60+ Minority	60+ Low Income	60+ Geographic Isolation	Weighted Totals (Parity Points)	2024 Non-Adjusted Parity %	Variance: 2020 to 2024	Impact w/ \$12.9 million Budget (2024)
Nevada	37,707	6,812	8,760	28,086	81,365	7.85%	0.28%	\$ 35,681
Placer	92,032	46,166	19,010	30,165	187,373	18.08%	0.32%	\$ 40,986
Sacramento	195,137	301,356	91,270	16,650	604,413	58.32%	-0.03%	\$ (3,361)
Sierra	1,399	262	320	1,929	3,910	0.38%	-0.01%	\$ (1,863)
Sutter	13,186	19,702	6,490	5,910	45,288	4.37%	-0.31%	\$ (39,702)
Yolo	28,187	33,330	10,370	6,821	78,708	7.59%	-0.23%	\$ (30,130)
Yuba	10,742	10,194	4,720	9,714	35,370	3.41%	-0.01%	\$ (1,610)
Totals	378,390	417,822	140,940	99,275	1,036,427	100.00%	0.00%	\$ (0)

^a CA Department of Finance population projections (5-year groups), special run request, February 2024.

^b American Community Survey (ACS) Special Tabulation on Aging, 2017-21 estimates.

^c US Census 2020, Table P12.

Application of the Initial Parity Percentages: SFY 2025-26

In order to isolate the effect of recalculating the Parity Formula, the “Impact” column in the chart above assumes funding levels have remained constant since 2020. That is a false assumption. Four years ago, AAA4’s Parity Pool was \$7,903,093. Today, it is \$10,274,905 which represents a net increase of \$2,371,812 or 30.0%. Virtually all of this increase (96.9%) is due to an influx of State General Funds (Augmentation Funds) to supplement Title III-C Nutrition Providers – a response to concerns about rising inflation.

In keeping with long-standing precedent, these additional Nutrition dollars have been distributed proportionally. For example, if any given Nutrition Provider receives 10% of all Title III-C funds, then that Provider would have received 10% of the State Augmentation Funds. Such a large increase of dollars in a single service category has resulted in substantial Parity Drift whereby AAA4's smaller counties (which have the highest proportion of nutrition dollars) have exceeded their Parity Shares at the expense of AAA4's larger counties (which have the lowest proportion of nutrition dollars). The consequences of this effect are evidenced in the chart below.

**Funding Levels by County: Initial Parity Shares vs. Actuals
With Per Capita Figures Added**

Current Spending Per Capita: Age 60+ (SFY 2024-25)	COUNTY	INITIAL PARITY SHARES (For SFY 2025-26)		ACTUAL AWARDS (SFY 2024-25)	OVER & UNDER
		Percent	Dollars		
\$20.62	Nevada	7.85%	\$ 806,635	\$ 847,894	\$ 41,259
\$13.85	Placer	18.08%	\$ 1,857,575	\$ 1,594,474	\$ (263,101)
\$16.89	Sacramento	58.32%	\$ 5,992,019	\$ 5,839,794	\$ (152,225)
\$146.70	Sierra	0.38%	\$ 38,763	\$ 223,846	\$ 185,083
\$26.69	Sutter	4.37%	\$ 448,975	\$ 614,967	\$ 165,992
\$31.51	Yolo	7.59%	\$ 780,289	\$ 725,956	\$ (54,333)
\$27.02	Yuba	3.41%	\$ 350,650	\$ 427,973	\$ 77,323
\$17.50	PSA 4	100.00%	\$ 10,274,906	\$ 10,274,904	\$ (2)

Agency on Aging Area 4

9/5/2024

Currently, AAA4 is projecting flat funding for SFY 2025-26 (the first year of the major RFP cycle), thus without any new dollars entering the Parity Pool, rebalancing funding levels by County is a zero-sum scenario. Placer, Sacramento and Yolo are all currently receiving *less* than their Initial Parity Share; they cannot realize any gains unless Nevada, Sierra, Sutter and Yuba experience losses because those Counties are all currently receiving *more* than their Initial Share.

As a reminder, "Initial" Parity figures are figures that have not yet been adjusted for Sierra County. Since 2020, Placer and Sacramento Counties have effectively subsidized Sierra to maintain a sufficient fiscal baseline for Congregate Meals, Home-Delivered Meals, Legal Services and Outreach. The Governing Board has always supported Sierra County in this way, but the manner in which it is done varies. Generally, the Counties that have benefited most from Parity resets have been the Counties to divert a portion of their added funds to Sierra.

Approval of new Parity Percentages for the 2025-27 Request for Proposals is a two-step process. The Governing Board should first decide upon a baseline funding level for Sierra County during the October 2024 meeting (Sierra's Adjusted Parity Percentage is then computed based on that amount).

At the November 2024 meeting, the Board will be prepared for the second decision point – choosing which Counties will divert what sums to Sierra County to reach their SFY 2025-26 baseline (the Adjusted Parity Percentages for the contributing Counties are then computed based on their resulting award amounts). The outcome of this second step will dictate final funding levels for all seven Counties unless exceptions are granted. In 2020 for example, following a motion by Sacramento Supervisor Nottoli, the Governing Board voted to divert \$8,000 from Sacramento County to Yuba County to lessen the amount of Parity reductions that were needed there (Yuba’s Parity percentage was not changed).

Limitations on the Transfer of Funds between Titles

Older Americans Act funds are not guaranteed; they are appropriated every year through the federal budget process. Congress has always allocated more funds to Nutrition (Title III-C) than to Supportive Services (Title III-B). Agencies on Aging are allowed to transfer up to 30% of the III-C funds to III-B without approval from the State. Historically, AAA4 has ~~not or exceeded that 30% threshold~~ **exercised this option** because over time, the demand for services like Transportation has consistently increased while the demand for traditional Congregate Meals has declined. On August 20th, AAA4 Staff submitted the following question to CDA:

Since 2020, our Title III-B providers have not benefitted from ongoing increases to their baseline awards even though their operating costs have increased. If our AAA were to address this imbalance by transferring more funds from Title III-C to Title III-B than we do now, would CDA view that transfer as an improper supplement of the State General Fund Nutrition Augmentation dollars?

The State responded, in part, by stating “*transfers from IIIC to IIIB are closely evaluated since transfers remove funding that is intended to meet the critical need of providing more meals to more older adults. Some considerations include if there has been a decrease in actual IIIC service units from prior FY and if there a decrease in proposed IIIC service units from PY in the Area Plan or Area Plan Update (i.e., is there a planned reduction in services).*” Since any meaningful reduction in Nutrition funding would inevitably result in a decrease in the number of meals provided, the more concise answer is: Yes, such a transfer would be improper and not allowed.

This means AAA4’s ability to “generate” additional Title III-B dollars is effectively frozen at the 30% transfer limit. **Currently, the Agency’s transfer percentage is at 13%; therefore, additional dollars could be moved from Nutrition to Supportive Services if that is desired.** ~~Absent an increase in federal III-B or III-C funds, the Agency can only increase individual III-B program budgets by reducing the number of total awards. More specifically, this could be accomplished through the reduction or elimination of non-mandatory programs such as Employment and Minor Home Modification.~~

Straw Poll Questions

Ad hoc County Workgroups have been struggling to complete their funding recommendations due to the uncertainties surrounding this particular Parity/RFP cycle. AAA4's Governing Board is scheduled to take action on the Parity Formula in October and November. There are 17 seats on the Board. Sacramento County has 5 seats; the other six counties each have 2 seats.

In an effort to narrow the field of potential outcomes, AAA4 Staff request all voting Board members participate in this exercise. These votes are not binding, but they are intended to measure the "temperature" of the Board as a whole around key decision points. This should help the Workgroups focus on the most plausible scenarios rather than all possible scenarios.

- 1) Should AAA4 continue to use the Intrastate Funding Formula (aka, the Parity Formula) to set **initial** county funding levels as the starting place for discussion?

Yes (Arguments in favor)	No (Arguments in opposition)
There is a 30-year precedent for doing it this way.	AAA4 is not required to do it this way.
The formula yields definitive dollar amounts.	The formula yields uneven dollars per capita for the age 60+ population.
The State does not expect to implement any changes to the IFF until 2027.	The State is actively exploring making changes to the IFF.
Other:	Other:
Straw Votes in Favor = Sacramento, Sierra, Yolo & Yuba	Straw Votes in Opposition =

Continued on next page

- 2) Should AAA4 continue to subsidize Sierra County based on projected expenditures to operate the “core” services (as opposed to some other method)?

Yes (Arguments in favor)	No (Arguments in opposition)
There is a long-standing precedent for doing it this way.	AAA4 is not required to do it this way.
This approach yields definitive dollar amounts.	This approach gives Sierra-based service providers an advantage over providers in the other six counties.
Sierra County is a service desert.	This approach gives Sierra County a disproportionate amount of funding.
Other:	Other:
Straw Votes in Favor = Sacramento, Sierra, Yolo & Yuba	Straw Votes in Opposition =

- 3) Should AAA4 consider setting minimum baseline funding levels in Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba Counties?

Yes (Arguments in favor)	No (Arguments in opposition)
Establishing a fiscal “floor” below which a county would not descend would add stability.	Floors would offer false stability if they were not fiscally sustainable in the long term, especially in a deficit scenario.
This approach would mitigate funding <u>reductions</u> for counties that are <i>above</i> their parity percentage targets.	This approach would mitigate funding <u>increases</u> for counties that are <i>below</i> their parity percentage targets.
CDA does this for the smallest agencies on aging.	AAA4 has never done this; unintended consequences could result.
Other:	Other:
Other:	Other:
Straw Votes in Favor =	Straw Votes in Opposition =
THIS DISCUSSION WAS TABLED DUE TO TIME CONSTRAINTS.	

NEW INFORMATION:

Final votes on three decision points are scheduled for the Friday, November 8th meeting. This will be Joint Meeting of AAA4's Advisory Council and Governing Board.

1) Final Parity Percentages Set (Adjusted for Sierra County)

As explained above, the approval of new Parity Percentages is a two-step process. The Governing Board first decides upon a baseline funding level for Sierra County, then the Board chooses which Counties will divert what sums to Sierra County to reach that baseline. A variety of potential scenarios will be included in the November Board Packet. Those Counties that contribute to Sierra County have their Parity Percentages lowered accordingly so that the sum of all Parity Shares remains at 100%.

It is important to note that the setting of Parity Percentages does not necessarily dictate Final Funding Levels for Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba Counties. Historically, when facing significant funding reductions, Counties have made good faith efforts to reach their "target" amounts, but some have fallen short of those goals. When they have done so, their Parity percentages have not been changed. The Governing Board is scheduled to vote on Final Funding Levels at the December 13th meeting.

2) RFP Inclusion/Exclusion Decisions (Title III-B, Title III-C & Title VII)

AAA4 has discretion to decide whether to include in-house Direct Service programs in its RFP cycles. In general, excluding them reduces the administrative burden for the Agency, and including them proves whether any potential competitors actually exist. On October 4th the Grants Review Committee briefly discussed this topic but did not vote.

3) Award Renewals for the 2025-27 Grant Cycle (Titles III-D & III-E)

AAA4 conducts two separate RFP Cycles (the Minor and the Major) on an overlapping "Olympic" schedule. However, each cycle is a two-year cycle, renewable for an additional two years. In 2023 at the conclusion of the latest Minor RFP Cycle, the Governing Board awarded funds to Title III-D Health Promotion and Title III-E Family Caregiver providers. The Board must now vote to renew (or not renew) those awards for two additional years. In a non-renewal scenario, the current programs could be added to the 2025-27 RFP or discontinued at the end of the contract period (June 30, 2025). On October 4th the Grants Review Committee briefly discussed this topic but did not vote.

PRESENTATION ITEM VI. D.

TO: AAA4 ADVISORY COUNCIL
FROM: Pam Miller
DATE: October 10, 2024
SUBJECT: 2024 Master Plan for Aging (MPA) Day of Action

Highlights from October 8, 2024, MPA event to include progress, renewed shared commitments and California's 10-year blueprint.